

## PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. APPM/004432.D1/DISPLAY/AHRDWR/RKK

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 24, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 24, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claims 4-6 and 14-16 are canceled. Claims 1, 7, 8, 17, and 18 are amended and claims 21-26 are new. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 1-3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Ushikawa* (WO 97/20340). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 has been amended. *Ushikawa* recites pin sets that operate independently to raise the substrate into transfer or processing position. The pin sets do not contact the bowed section of substrate. *Ushikawa*, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest a method for dechucking a substrate comprising the steps of projecting a first set of lift pins a first distance above a surface of a substrate support, projecting a second set of lift pins a second distance above the surface of the substrate support that is less than the first distance projected by the first set of lift pins, causing the substrate to form a bowed region between a plurality of the first set of lift pins by contacting a substrate with the first set of lift pins, and contacting the substrate in the bowed region with the second set of lift pins as recited in amended claim 1, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-8 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ushikawa* (WO 97/20340) in view of *Lenz* (U.S. 6,305,677). Claims 9-13, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ushikawa* (WO 97/20340) in view of *White* (U.S. 5,352,294). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. *Ushikawa* projects the first set of pins and second set of pins independently, as described above. *Lenz* teaches away from the claimed subject matter by moving the first set of pins to eliminate adhesion, then the second set of pins

Page 6

398270\_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. APPM/004432.D1/DISPLAY/AHRDWR/RKK

raises the substrate elevation. *White* suggests using a lift plate with no second set of lift pins.

*Ushikawa, Lenz, and White*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a method for dechucking a substrate comprising the steps of projecting a first set of lift pins a first distance above a surface of a substrate support, projecting a second set of lift pins a second distance above the surface of the substrate support that is less than the first distance projected by the first set of lift pins, causing the substrate to form a bowed region between a plurality of the first set of lift pins by contacting a substrate with the first set of lift pins, and contacting the substrate in the bowed region with the second set of lift pins as recited in amended claim 1, and claims dependent thereon. *Ushikawa, Lenz, and White*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a method for dechucking a substrate comprising the steps of moving a lift plate towards a substrate support to displace a first set of lift pins and a second set of lift pins, extending the first set of lift pins with the lift plate a first distance above a support surface of the substrate support, extending the second set of lift pins with the lift plate a second distance above the support surface of the substrate support, wherein the second distance is less than the first distance, causing the substrate to form a bowed region between a plurality of the first set of lift pins by contacting a substrate with the first set of lift pins, and contacting the substrate in the bowed region with the second set of lift pins as recited in amended claim 12, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Page 7

398270\_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. APPM/004432.D1/DISPLAY/AHRDWR/RKK

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith M. Tackett  
Registration No. 32,008  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)